

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of: Helmut Emmelmann  
U.S. Patent App. No.: 09/449,021  
Filed: November 24, 1999  
Title: *Interactive Server Side Components*  
Group Art Unit: 2192  
Examiner: C. Kendall  
Confirmation No. 5718

**APPLICANT'S SUMMARY OF  
TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS**

## SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS

Applicant and his counsel appreciate the help and courtesy of the Examiner in telephone interviews with applicant's counsel on June 20, 2007 and June 28, 2007. The Examiner prepared summaries of these interviews, which were mailed by the Patent Office on July 2, 2007 and July 13, 2007, respectively. Applicant notes that the summary mailed July 2<sup>nd</sup> incorrectly states the date of the first interview as May 19, 2007.

On June 20<sup>th</sup>, the Examiner telephoned applicant's counsel, and the following items were discussed:

The Examiner stated that, after talking with his supervisor, he believed that applicant could get allowed claims with some minor amendments. Specifically, he stated that the feature of dynamically editing a web page of a running application was distinct over the cited art, but not explicitly recited in the claims. Applicant's counsel stated his belief that this feature was implicit in various of the independent claims, as set forth in prior arguments, including applicant's appeal brief. However, the Examiner wanted this feature to be explicitly recited in the claims.

In addition, the Examiner complained that some of the claims are directed to a system, but claim software, and thus are not statutory. Approved formats for software claims were discussed.

Applicant's counsel agreed to contact applicant to discuss the foregoing, and promised to get back to the Examiner as soon as possible.

On June 28<sup>th</sup>, applicant's counsel telephoned the Examiner, and the following items were discussed:

Applicant's counsel noted that independent claims 1, 59, 90, and 125 form a first group of claims wherein the concept of dynamically editing a running application can be readily incorporated into the independent claims. For example, applicant's counsel noted that claim 1 includes a document generator program element that is running an application, and counsel suggested amending the editor element of claim 1 to read "an

editor program having instructions for dynamically operating on the pages displayed by the browser.” The Examiner thought this limitation would be acceptable.

Applicant’s counsel also noted that it was not yet apparent to applicant how the feature discussed above would be incorporated into the other independent claims. This may lead applicant to cancel some of the independent claims.

For example, applicant’s counsel noted that independent claim 6 is different than the first group in that there is no editor element, and instead, the point of distinction argued for claim 6 is a component that reacts interactively on user input by executing instructions contained in the component. The examiner did not agree that this feature was distinct.

Applicant agreed to provide proposed amendments as soon as possible.

Proposed amendments to the independent claims were faxed to the Examiner on July 20, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 30, 2007

By: /Richard A. Nebb/  
Richard A. Nebb  
Reg. No. 33,540

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP  
575 Market Street, Suite 2500  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2871  
Telephone: (415) 369-9660 x212  
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665  
[rnebb@vierramagen.com](mailto:rnebb@vierramagen.com)